

The Effects of Multimodal Communication Classroom on the Learning Performance of EFL Learners from the Perspective of Translanguaging

Jianbin Zhu*, Yingying Gu¹

College of Foreign Studies, Guilin University of Technology, Guangxi 541006, China

*Correspondence: 2017135@glut.edu.cn

Abstract: Daily communication is often pertained to multimodality since people will utilize various expressions to extend meanings. The paper attempts to explore the effects of multimodal semiotics on the academic achievement of EFL learners in China. In the meantime, the 21st century has viewed the significance of translanguaging pedagogy, such education method is common in Chinese classrooms since teachers tend to shuttle between Chinese and English in order to describe new knowledge in detail. The article intends to investigate the meaning of multimodal communication which is one of natures of translanguaging. The paper makes exploration on the EFL learners' performance and their preference toward the pedagogical methods in terms of questionnaire and field observation. It can be concluded that translanguaging shapes a new perspective of bilingual or multilingual education. Besides, multimodal semiotics classroom and free language usage among classmates and teachers show remarkable efficiency on the knowledge learning. Furthermore, students demonstrate optimistic attitude toward the translanguaging pedagogy. The article proposes suggestions for futuristic education which should utilize multimodal ways under the translanguaging practice to inculcate knowledge and foster talents.

Keywords: Multimodal communication classroom, Translanguaging, Education, Translanguaging space.

1. Introduction

The article examines the effects of multimodal communication standing on the basis of translanguaging on the learning process. In China, English-learning is pervasive in school education while some regulated standards request language learning classroom should focus on the target language (TL) as conducive to students learning performance. However, translanguaging receiving great attention in the 21st century has transformed this view, it provides great support for multilingual usage in the classrooms which further enhance language-learning interests especially for multilingual minority students (Wei, 2014). Furthermore, a hefty of studies have been made on the immigrant students to investigate the translanguaging practice for their classroom learning. Few researches pay attention to Chinese language learners. The paper intends to focus attention on EFL learners in China to bridge the research gap. 'Translanguaging' is from Baker (2011) translation of Williams' trawysieithu (Williams, 1996), originally coined to describe a pedagogical practice in bilingual classrooms where the input (e.g. reading and listening) is in one language and the output (e.g. speaking and writing) in another. Baker (2011) discusses a range of potential advantages of translanguaging in the bilingual classroom in developing the learner's academic language skills in both languages. Besides, Multimodal communication is the nature of human interactions (Wei, 2018). Besides, human behaviors will synchronize with different multimodal communications according to different contexts (Louwerse et al., 2012). Translanguaging is both going between different linguistic structures and systems, including different modalities (speaking, writing, signing, listening, reading, remembering) and going beyond them (Lewis et al., 2012a). It can be concluded that translanguaging in nature includes multimodal communication but it transcends the language

system. With the wave of globalization, it of great necessity to master more than two languages to catch up with the growth of information age. However, the aim the language learning is by no means to shift persons from one monolingual speaker into another one (Wei, 2018). Multimodal communication adds distinct flavor for daily communication and education. At the same time, translanguaging pedagogy provides theoretical and practical uphold for education. Our study here intends to examine the efficiency multimodal communication and translanguaging in order to propose feasible and effective suggestions for future studies. The paper plans to conduct discussions on the relationship through questionnaires and interviews to make persuasive conclusions for translanguaging pedagogy.

2. Research Background

2.1. The Framework of Theories

The term 'multimodality' was used to highlight that people use multiple means of meaning making. It was a recognition of the need to move beyond the empirical boundaries of existing disciplines and develop theories and methods that can account for the ways in which we use gesture, inscription, speech and other means together in order to produce meanings that cannot be accounted for by any of the existing disciplines (Jewitt et al., 2016). Modes such as image and object design are made up of elements and rules for combining them, which can be used to serve four main social functions: (1) to construct our experience of the word, (2) to make logical connections in that world, (3) to enact social relations, and (4) to organize the message (Jewitt et al., 2016)p21-27. Multimodal communication has close relationship with systematic functional linguistics which developed by Halliday. Halliday studied language as a semiotic resource, resulting in SFL. However, Halliday always understood that language was one semiotic resource

amongst many constituting society and culture (Jewitt et al., 2016) p31-57. SFL is well suited to the study of multimodality because the underlying premise that semiotic resources are tools for creating meaning applies equally well to the multitude of sign systems in society: for example, language, images, gesture, music, dress, architecture and so forth. M. A. K. Halliday (1978) proposed that meaning-making is conceptualized as choice from a range of interlocking options. Halliday argued that the grammar of a language is not a set of rules but 'a resource for making meanings' (1978: 192). Based on his theory, Hodge et al. (1988) developed their theory of social semiotics which was interested in accounting for the different ways in which human beings have engaged with semiotic resources in all kinds of societies in history. In social semiotic theory, all modes of communication are given equally serious attention (Stein, 2007). Translanguaging is both going between different linguistic structures and systems, including different modalities (speaking, writing, signing, listening, reading, remembering) and going beyond them. It includes the full range of linguistic performances of multilingual language users for purposes that transcend the combination of structures, the alternation between systems, the transmission of information and the representation of values, identities and relationships (Wei, 2011). We communicate in a new space where people are able to interact with each other through switching freely among individual repertoire. Translanguaging space is not a space where different identities, values and practices simply co-exist, but combine together to generate new identities, values and practices. The boundaries of a translanguaging space are ever-shifting; they exist primarily in the mind of the individual who creates and occupies it, and the construction of the space is an ongoing, lifelong process (Wei, 2011). The resources individuals use to create their own space include not only their own cognitive capacity but also personal histories and experiences, attitudes, values and ideologies that they have acquired through interactions with others under specific socio-historical conditions. The meaning of the prefix-trans has multiple meanings, (1) a trans-system and trans-spaces that facilitate fluid practices that not only go between but more importantly go beyond socially constructed language and education systems, structures and practices to engage diverse students' multiple meaning-making systems and subjectivities. (2) its transformative nature transforming not only subjectivities, but also cognitive and social structures. the trans-disciplinary consequences of the languaging and education analysis, providing a tool for understanding not only language practices on the one hand and education on the other, but also human sociality, human cognition and learning, social relations and social structures (García & Wei, 2014). At the same time, the -ing suffix urges us to focus on the momentariness, instantaneity and the transient nature of human communication in the present case, the ongoing activities in the classroom setting (Wei & Lin, 2019). Furthermore, M. A. Halliday (1992) also pointed out that transdisciplinary research is very different from 'inter-' or 'multi-disciplinary' research because the latter implies that one still pursues research focused within the disciplines, while building bridges between them and assembling the research efforts into a 'collection'; whereas the real alternative to transcend disciplinary boundaries to achieve the kind of integrated focus necessary to research issues in the fields such as multimodal semiotics and education.

The paper is prone to put emphasis on examining the

effects of multimodal semiotics classroom through the intrinsic connection between multimodality and translanguaging because translanguaging pedagogy encourage learners to transcend structure and system boundaries to achieve accommodate transfer among different semiotics. The real aim of education is by no means to transform students from monolingual-presided community into another monolingual one. On the other hand, multimodal classrooms act as effective means to activate learning environment and motivation which add various interests on the studying. In addition, translanguaging creates a space in which learners and teachers flying over the boundaries are capable to make use of multiple semiotics to interact with each other efficiently. The article not only testify to the influence of multimodality but also provide a picture for future studies as it presents a novel view to discuss multimodal semiotics from the perspective of translanguaging. EFL learners are able to use various modes to interacting freely in the translanguaging space.

2.2. Multimodal Communication

Modes are a 'set of resources people in a given culture can use to communicate' (Bainbridge & Malicky, 2000). Multimodality refers to the more macro-oriented organizers of textual production and artifacts as it is 'tied to larger discourses and ideologies such as globalization, cultural migration, and technology' and involves the choices in modalities that are available (Rowell & Pahl, 2007). Multimodality, conceptually, offers the opportunity for exploring multiperspectivity, different viewpoints, narrations and translations which constantly change what the object is, students learn that different modes provide different narratives or 'takes' on the same phenomenon (Stein, 2007) p143. Oviatt et al. (2004) in a conference claimed that multimodal interface users spontaneously respond to dynamic changes in their own cognitive load by shifting to multimodal communication as load increases with task difficulty and communicative complexity. In specific researches by field scholars, Heydon (2012) makes detailed elaboration on the multimodal communication and arrived at a conclusion that children's communication was multifaceted, and future-looking while some of the adults' were constrained by limited identity options related to their position in the life course. Ho and Putra (2016) revealed that each mode of representation plays a unique function in representing different aspects of scientific meaning. Transnational and translingual learners mobilize their multilingual, multimodal, and multisemiotic repertoires, as well as their learning and work experiences, as resources in language learning (Wei & Ho, 2018). They emphasize that we need to go beyond the artificial divides of the different modalities of language learning to strengthen the connections between research on bilingualism and multilingualism and research on language teaching and learning. Bateman and Schmidt-Borcherding (2018) argue that the more complex multimodal interactions and artifacts become, the more a fine-grained view of multimodal communication of the kind we propose will be essential for engaging with medias. Yamada-Rice (2014), for another, the dominance of screen media has evolved out of progress in digital technologies. Screens foreground the visual mode, this mode has become increasingly important to contemporary multimodal communication practices. It showed interaction with multimodal texts occurred with interest in the visual mode, which was connected to their interests in aspects of

their physical environment. In practice, however, many discourses are multimodal. The film medium, for instance, usually combines visuals, spoken language, written language, music, sound, and bodily behavior, and is thus highly multimodal (Forceville, 2020). A number of scholars focus their studies on the animal multimodal communication. Fröhlich and van Schaik (2018) tested the biological function of multimodal communication of great apes based on content-based, efficacy-based and inter-signal interaction hypotheses. Pouw et al. (2021) also agree to the recognition that multimodal communication exists in human and non-human animals. They provide an integrative overview of converging findings that show how multimodal processes occurring at neural, bodily, as well as social interactional levels each contribute uniquely to the complex rhythms that characterize communication in human and non-human animals. With the development of information, the collaboration between human and robot spark lots of discussions. Wang et al. (2017) testify to A human–robot collaborative assembly system is developed with a novel and comprehensive structure. Kardos et al. (2018) proposed that human in controlling systems should send out context-suited information through multimodal communication in collaborative works to lift traditional sole order for just pushing buttons installed at fixed positions.

However, few works have contributed to the connection between multimodal communication and translanguaging although both have intrinsic embrace and close tie. The article will explain the research on translanguaging elaborately in which it will find that in the translanguaging space multimodal communication will receive the greatest freedom which promotes the construction of the space reversely.

2.3. Translanguaging

From the very beginning, Williams (1996) made it very clear that Translanguaging is not an object but a practice and a process. It is a linguistic practice that involves different languages and language varieties. But more importantly, it is a process of knowledge construction that makes use of but goes beyond individual languages. It concerns effective communication, function rather than form, cognitive activity, as well as language production (Lewis et al., 2012a, 2012b). García (2009), for example, talks about Translanguaging as the process of making meaning, shaping experience, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of multiple languages. Translanguaging is not just something bilinguals do when they feel they are lacking words or phrases needed to express themselves in a monolingual environment. The trans-prefix communicates the ways that multilingual people's language practices in fact "go beyond" use of state-endorsed named language systems (García & Li Wei, 2014, p. 42; Li Wei, 2011).

In regarding to the advantages of translanguaging, the classroom integration of fluent first language (L1) speakers and second language (L2) learners of various levels of attainment can be facilitated by translanguaging (Lewis et al., 2012b). In translanguaging space, languages are not discrete and separated, but form an integrated system for them; multilingual competence emerges out of local practices where multiple languages are negotiated for communication; competence doesn't consist of separate competencies for each language, but a multicompetence that functions symbiotically for the different languages in one's repertoire (Canagarajah, 2011). MacSwan (2017) discussed the efficiency of

translanguaging from multilingual perspective which accepts individual multilingualism as not only psychologically real, in the integrated sense, but also universal. Creese and Blackledge (2010) examined the bilingual education in complementary schools through translanguaging pedagogy. They take a language ecology perspective and seeks to describe the interdependence of skills and knowledge across languages. García and Kleifgen (2020), on the other side, investigated the relation between translanguaging and literacy pedagogy. Their study on translanguaging in literacies focuses on the actions of multilingual readers and writers, which go beyond traditional understandings of language, literacy, and other concepts, such as bi/multilingualism and bi/multilingual literacy. Pedagogical translanguaging provides support for English learners with the competence to acquire additional language without abandoning their first language in language learning classroom (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). In addition, in relation to the translanguaging and linguistic landscape, semiotic modes and multimodal communication in places should be inspected by translanguaging view but focus on their inner ties among semiotic assemblages in order to the understanding of how different trajectories of people, semiotic resources and objects meet at particular moments and places, and thus helps us to see the importance of things, the consequences of the body, and the significance of place alongside the meanings of linguistic resources. What's more, translanguaging is also related to social identity, Li and Zhu (2013) discussed 'linguaging' which refers to the process of using language to gain knowledge, to make sense, to articulate one's thought and to communicate about using language. As we mentioned before, the prefix-trans has three layers of meanings: trans-system/structure/space in which individual value, identity, relationship, and so on are interwoven. The trans- also means transformative it brings together different dimensions of the multilingual speakers' linguistic, cognitive, and social skills, their knowledge and experience of the social world and their attitudes and beliefs, and thus a new identity for multilingual speaker or bilingual speaker. Creese and Blackledge (2015) focus in particular on 'translanguaging' that has viewed identities as socially constructed in interaction and considered the relationship between language and identities in contexts where communication is mobile and complex. And the last meaning is transdisciplinary, It focuses our analytic attention on revealing the multilingual language users' creativity and criticality that manifest in their linguistic performances. Translanguaging is better to understand language practices and attitudes because the student integrates diverse linguistic and semiotic resources into a unified expression of identity, relying on the multimodal affordances of digital writing to accomplish his communicative goals (Schreiber, 2015). However, the combination of translanguaging and multimodal communication is rarely received attention. Only a few studies have been made on their more strengthened force of both, Canals (2021) made research on the connections between translanguaging and multimodal communication. He revealed the interplay between multimodality and learners' multilingual repertoires which reinforced and complemented meaning-making during these episodes. The author also notified that multimodal communication includes speech elements but also gaze, gestures, and images. In CMC (computer mediated communication) these elements become particularly important because they are mediated by another layer of

modality enabled, but sometimes also constrained, by technological tools. In terms of interweaving translanguaging and multimodal communication, the efficacy of language learning will be further underpinned as multimodality assists speakers to create translanguaging space more easily and translanguaging *verse visa* also props up the multimodal communication in different contexts.

The article adopts the term translanguaging which becomes particularly useful to analyze the linguistic behavior of plurilingual language learners who resort to different languages to construct their speech, convey their messages and interpret each other's utterances and integrates the term with multimodal communication to discuss the reinforced power on the learning effects. The paper attempts to investigate the effects of multimodal communication on EFL learners' learning achievement from the perspective of translanguaging, we try to explore various modes of communication occurred in the process of learning education and learners will utilize individual linguistic repertoire to convey meanings, at the same time, they usually plus multiple modes such as image, gesture, gaze, etc onto the communication to animate the meaning and reinforce the efficiency of learning.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

Our study focuses attention on the English-major learners as they are definitely exposed to different languages to acquire various linguistic knowledge. The paper pay attention to participants whose ages are in 18-30, and 70 percent of them are graduate students, and 30 percent of whom are undergraduates. We target at 30 participants in which 19 females and 11 males whose English proficiencies are pretty good since all of them have passes the College English Band 6 which is a test for college students' English acquisition including listening, reading, and writing. Therefore, they are capable to have knowledge of foreign language pedagogy.

3.2. Instrument

Our questionnaire is adopted from (Chen, 2021; Gan, 2012). The questionnaire is divided into four parts. The first part includes individual information (gender, age, and educational background); the second one is multimodal intention survey; and the third part is translanguaging will investigation; and

the last section is the combination of both. Our questionnaire has high validity and reliability which can be as a reference to explore whether EFL learners are willing to adapt to multimodal and translanguaging pedagogy.

3.3. Procedures

We received 35 pieces of papers excluding 5 invalid ones in the end. At last, we export those 30 pieces of questionnaire data into SPSS 26 to analyze our data. Our questionnaire has high reliability in the five dimensionality respectively: the Cronbach's alpha is .912 in multimodal communication intention dimensionality; .929 in multimodal interaction in classroom with teachers and classmates dimensionality; .852 in the contrast between multimodal pedagogy and traditional education dimensionality; .834 in intention to translanguaging pedagogy dimensionality; .913 in willingness to the combination of multimodal communication and pedagogy dimensionality. And further, the overall reliability of the whole scale is .919. Furthermore, our scale is of good validity whose KMO coefficient is 0.684, and the P value of Bartlett is .000. Henceforth, our scale has high quality in reliability and validity. Accordingly, the high quality of our questionnaire enable our following analysis of those data to own favorable cornerstone.

3.4. Data Analysis

In the beginning, we made analysis of the five dimensionalities' mean score and SD in order to measure the different level of willingness to adapt to distinct pedagogical methods. We find that our participants with high intention to be instructed in the classroom phenomenon under multimodal communication plus translanguaging pedagogy which will facilitate the learning efficiency of knowledge. As is shown in table 1, the mean score of multimodal communication is 4.09 compared to 3.27 of traditional pedagogy. In addition, the willingness of translanguaging pedagogy also receive high mark, the mean score of translanguaging and the intention to both of combined education is 4.03 and 4.13 respectively, which means modern leaners are more willing to be educated in more diversified modes of teaching and learning environment. Overall, the data imply that learners are prone to choose novel ways of education rather than stand still in traditional pedagogy. Therefore, the reform of modern education may pay more attention to the shift to a more multimodal pedagogy under the reinforced power of translanguaging.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis

	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Multimodal intention	30	1.80	5.00	4.03	.82
Multimodal communication	30	2.50	5.00	4.15	.77
Traditional pedagogy	30	1.00	5.00	3.27	1.20
Translanguaging	30	2.25	5.00	4.03	.77
Combination of M and T	30	2.00	5.00	4.13	.86

Next, the correlation analysis was conducted. It can be concluded that the gender and educational background has little significance with other five dimensionalities including multimodal pedagogy, multimodal communication, traditional pedagogy, translanguaging, the combination of

translanguaging and multimodal communication as the P value of those correlation are all above 0.05. Therefore, there is a small connection among gender, educational background, and other five aspects shown in the following table 2 correlation analysis.

Table 2. Correlation analysis

		MP	MC	TRP	TP	CTM
Gender	Pearson Coefficient	-.14	.01	.02	.00	.12
	Sig.	.460	.943	.905	.991	.528
Educational background	Pearson coefficient	-.15	-.06	-.11	-.16	-.11
	Sig.	.419	.746	.554	.371	.556
	Cases	30	30	30	30	30

(MP: multimodal pedagogy; MC: multimodal communication; TRP: traditional pedagogy; TP: translanguaging pedagogy; CTM: combined translanguaging and multimodal communication)

Then, a regression analysis was carried out between multimodal communication and translanguaging pedagogy. The result revealed that there is close causal relationship between multimodal communication and translanguaging pedagogy. The ANOVA analysis indicates that the casual connection between them occur as learners with strong will to

adopt multimodal communication who will also be more likely to accept translanguaging way. In addition, the conclusion becomes more persuasive by the next coefficient analysis shown in table 4. Since the significant value $P=0.005<0.05$, so the causal relation between multimodal communication and translanguaging pedagogy can be established. On the other hand, the regression coefficient is 0.52, which means positive effects existed between them. Moreover, the value of VIF is 1.60 which proves that our regression model is stable.

Table 3. ANOVA analysis

Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	8.70	2	4.35	13.48	.000b
Residual	8.71	27	.32		
Total	17.41	29			

a. dependent variable: translanguaging pedagogy

b. predicted variable: (constant) multimodal communication

Table 4. Regression Coefficient analysis of M and T

Model	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficient	t	Sig.	Collinear statistics	
	B	S error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
Multimodal communication	.52	.17	.52	3.06	.005	.62	1.60

a. dependent variable: translanguaging pedagogy

At the same time, we conduct another mode of regression analysis among multimodal communication, traditional education intention, translanguaging, and their relationship with the willingness to adopt combined multimodal communication and translanguaging. The final ANOVA statistics add evidence that at least one factor of the four variables influence the dependent variable (CTM) as $P=.000$ in the following table 5. Then, the relationship becomes clear in table 6 regression coefficient analysis. As is indicated in

table 6, two elements including MC, TP have directly positive effects on CMT as their $P=.000<0.05$. However, although MP ($P=0.045$) also has little inner connection with CMT, it demonstrates negative influence on the development of combined multimodal communication and translanguaging pedagogy. On the contrary, as we expected, there is no evident tie between TRP and CMT ($P=0.774>0.05$). On the other hand, the value of all VIF is less than 5 which further proves the stability of the regression model.

Table 5. ANOVA analysis

Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	19.36	4	4.84	57.59	.000b
Residual	2.10	25	.08		
Total	21.46	29			

a. dependent variable: combined T and M

b. predicted variable: (constant), translanguaging, traditional pedagogy, multimodal pedagogy, multimodal communication

Table 6. Regression coefficient analysis of MP, MC, TRP, TP and CTM

Model	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficient	t	Sig.	Collinear statistics	
	B	S error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(constant)	-.20	.32		-.62	.538		
MP	-.19	.09	-.18	-2.10	.045	.52	1.90
MC	.41	.10	.37	4.04	.000	.46	2.17
TRP	-.01	.05	-.02	-.33	.744	.78	1.28
TP	.85	.10	.77	8.56	.000	.48	2.07

a. dependent variable: combined translanguaging and multimodal communication

What's more, the number of our participants who are willing to be instructed in translanguaging space accounts for 73.33 percent. As Wei (2011) pointed out that Translanguaging space is a space for the act of translanguaging as well as a space created through translanguaging. It is a space where the process of what Bhabha calls "cultural translation" between traditions takes place. The notion of translanguaging space embraces the concepts of creativity and criticality. Henceforth, it is advisable that multimodal communication should be adopted widely under the handling of translanguaging pedagogy.

4. Discussion

In modern era, translanguaging has gained much attention in pedagogy, which allows multiple languages achieve a subtle balance in the translanguaging space. Translanguaging embraces the multimodal social semiotic view that linguistic signs are part of a wider repertoire of modal resources that sign makers have at their disposal and that carry particular socio-historical and political associations (Kress, 2015). It foregrounds the different ways language users employ, create, and interpret different kinds of signs to communicate across contexts and participants and perform their different subjectivities (Wei & Lin, 2019). Ample studies have been conducted based on translanguaging pedagogy which mainly make great effort to encourage translanguaging way of education to construct students' identity especially for immigrant ones. The article stands at a unique view to investigate the feasibility of multimodal pedagogy regarding the translanguaging practice as foundation in Chinese classrooms. Because of the wide acceptance and high efficiency of translanguaging pedagogy, such kind of educational way should be advocated pervasively across teaching and learning fields. Translanguaging empowers both the learner and the teacher, transforms the power relations, and focuses the process of teaching and learning on making meaning, enhancing experience, and developing identity (Wei & Lin, 2019).

For another, field observation research has meanwhile been affiliated in order to better prove our findings. Two observations have been made during our research, one emphasizes multimodal communication in classroom where teachers begin teaching in terms of multimedia PPT and then use various signs to convey meanings. Our job is to observe the engagement of students to examine the effects of multimodal pedagogy. It demonstrates that students show greater interests to the knowledge learning. The overall engagement gains much momentum in multimodal pedagogical classroom where students utilize multiple semiotics in discussion activity, and the teacher makes reply through multimodal modes. The second observation puts

priority on translanguaging classroom. In the same vein, the aim of observation is to investigate the whole effects of instruction and learning participation. In contrast with the sole multimodal communication classroom, the translanguaging classroom not only involves multifaceted modes of communication among the teacher and students but also creates a space in which students and their teacher interact with each other freely by handling their linguistic repertoire. The phenomenon in this classroom has been activated. Students surrounded by positive classroom environment exhibit more motivation to attend to learning activities. They break languages' boundaries and other semiotic limits to make creativity and criticality in translanguaging space. In other words, knowledge construction and cultivation may be better acquired in such activated classrooms in which multimodal communication assisted by translanguaging pedagogy. Wei (2018) described translanguaging as a practice since it is shaped in an animate process, and it in nature incorporate multimodal communication into its developmental process. Consequently, the decisive achievement will be gained as our paper weaves multimodal teaching and learning into translanguaging pedagogy because the latter provides critical support for the former.

5. Conclusions

The paper launches an investigation through employing questionnaires and field observation. After a series data analysis, the descriptive analysis has shown a positive intention to adopt multimodal communication and translanguaging practice in classes; the Pearson coefficient indicates that gender and academic background has little correlation with multimodal and translanguaging pedagogy whereas regression model implies that there is significant relationship between the two pedagogical ways. Moreover, the next regression analysis was conducted to explain the relationship among different variables. The data make a clear demonstration of the casual ties among multimodal communication and translanguaging pedagogy, and their integration. A positive and remarkable relation exists among them while traditional pedagogy manifests a small connection with them. In addition, our field observation of two kinds of teaching classes testify to the positive impact of multimodal and translanguaging pedagogies on the learning feedback. The article attempts to peel back the layers of translanguaging which captures people's imagination and has been applied to pedagogy, everyday social interaction, multimodal communication (Wei, 2018). This sort of practice demonstrates great fuel in educational field, so workers and learners may reinforce learning performance through fitting themselves into multimodal and translanguaging surrounded classes and communications. The paper employs

experimental methods to prove their efficiency. Translanguaging in the linguistic realities of the 21st century, especially the fluid and dynamic practices that transcend the boundaries between named languages, language varieties, and language and other semiotic systems. One particular aspect of multilingual language users' social interaction that I want to emphasize is its multimodal and multisensory nature. (Wei, 2018). Instructors and learners transcend multiple boundaries to communication and promote together through adopting various modes of semiotics in the created translanguaging space.

Nonetheless, the paper is no short of limitations. The paper targets at limited number of participants and data may not be large enough. Also, the article initiates a completely novel view to investigate translanguaging practice focusing on Chinese EFL learners, which should be further proved by a heft of studies in the future. However, our essay integrates multimodal communication occurring in daily teaching and learning with the view of translanguaging practice to discuss their intricate tie and arrive at a conclusion to add evidence to our paper. Tranlanguaging has also been applied into cross-modal and multimodal communication, linguistic landscape, visual arts, music, and transgender discourse (Wei, 2018). Therefore, a number of studies can initiate discussion on its appliance and their integration. Moreover, researches based on translanguaging should be expanded into learners not just immigrants but also home students who are also needy for translanguaging education in the future. At last, in translanguaging space illustrated by Wei (2018), teachers and learners are able to transcend boundaries of semiotics to carry out translanguaging deeds including multimodal signs, images, various linguistic semiotics etc, and that the combination of multimodal and translanguaging pedagogy whose reinforced influence on the learning performance should gain more limelight in futuristic studies.

References

- [1] Bainbridge, Joyce, & Malicky, Grace. (2000). *Constructing meaning: Balancing elementary language arts*. 4rd ed.: Toronto: Thomson Nelson.
- [2] Baker, Colin. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. 4th ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.: Multilingual matters.
- [3] Bateman, John A, & Schmidt-Borcherding, Florian. (2018). The communicative effectiveness of education videos: Towards an empirically-motivated multimodal account. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 2(3), 59.
- [4] Canagarajah, Suresh. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied linguistics review*, 2(1), 1-28.
- [5] Canals, Laia. (2021). Multimodality and translanguaging in negotiation of meaning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 54(3), 647-670.
- [6] Cenoz, Jasone, & Gorter, Durk. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300-311.
- [7] Chen, Panpan. (2021). *A Study on Translanguaging in Chinese as a Second Language Classroom for Overseas Students in China*. (Master's Degree D), Hubei University of Technology, Available from Cnki
- [8] Creese, Angela, & Blackledge, Adrian. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The modern language journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- [9] Creese, Angela, & Blackledge, Adrian. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20-35.
- [10] Forceville, Charles. (2020). *Visual and multimodal communication: Applying the relevance principle*: Oxford University Press, USA. p68.
- [11] Fröhlich, Marlen, & van Schaik, Carel P. (2018). The function of primate multimodal communication. *Animal Cognition*, 21(5), 619-629.
- [12] Gan, Luoying. (2012). *An Experimental Research on the Effects of Multimodal Pedagogy on the Acquisition of English Words*. (Master's Degree D), Gannan Normal University, Available from Cnki
- [13] García, Ofelia. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*: Oxford: Blackwell.
- [14] García, Ofelia, & Kleifgen, Jo Anne. (2020). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading research quarterly*, 55(4), 553-571.
- [15] García, Ofelia, & Wei, Li. (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 3-10). Palgrave Pivot, London. : Springer. p3.
- [16] Halliday, Michael AK. (1992). *New ways of meaning: The challenge to applied linguistics*.
- [17] Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*: London: Edward Arnold.
- [18] Heydon, Rachel M. (2012). Multimodal communication and identities options in an intergenerational art class. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 10(1), 51-69.
- [19] Ho, Caroline, & Putra, Gde Buana Sandila. (2016). Developing multimodal communication competencies: A case of disciplinary literacy focus in Singapore. In *Using multimodal representations to support learning in the science classroom* (pp. 135-158): Springer.
- [20] Hodge, Bob, et al. (1988). *Social semiotics*: Cornell University Press.
- [21] Jewitt, Carey, et al. (2016). *Introducing multimodality*. 1st ed. . London, Britain. p2-5: Routledge.
- [22] Kardos, Csaba, et al. (2018). Context-dependent multimodal communication in human-robot collaboration. *Procedia CIRP*, 72, 15-20.
- [23] Kress, Gunther. (2015). Semiotic work: Applied Linguistics and a social semiotic account of Multimodality. *Aila Review*, 28(1), 49-71.
- [24] Lewis, Gwyn, et al. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655-670.
- [25] Lewis, Gwyn, et al. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641-654.
- [26] Lewis, Gwyn, et al. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655-670.
- [27] Lewis, Gwyn, et al. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641-654.
- [28] Li, Wei, & Zhu, Hua. (2013). Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied linguistics*, 34(5), 516-535.

- [29] Louwse, Max M, et al. (2012). Behavior matching in multimodal communication is synchronized. *Cognitive science*, 36(8), 1404-1426.
- [30] MacSwan, Jeff. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 167-201.
- [31] Oviatt, Sharon, et al. (2004). When do we interact multimodally? Cognitive load and multimodal communication patterns. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 6th international conference on Multimodal interfaces.
- [32] Pouw, Wim, et al. (2021). Multilevel rhythms in multimodal communication. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 376(1835), 20200334.
- [33] Rowsell, Jennifer, & Pahl, Kate. (2007). Sedimented identities in texts: Instances of practice. *Reading research quarterly*, 42(3), 388-404.
- [34] Schreiber, Brooke Ricker. (2015). "I am what I am": Multilingual identity and digital translanguaging. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(3), 69-87.
- [35] Stein, Pippa. (2007). *Multimodal pedagogies in diverse classrooms: Representation, rights and resources*: Routledge.
- [36] Wang, Xi Vincent, et al. (2017). Human–robot collaborative assembly in cyber-physical production: Classification framework and implementation. *CIRP annals*, 66(1), 5-8.
- [37] Wei, Li. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222-1235.
- [38] Wei, Li. (2014). Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children. *Classroom Discourse*, 5(2), 158-175.
- [39] Wei, Li. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30.
- [40] Wei, Li, & Ho, Wing Yee Jenifer. (2018). Language learning sans frontiers: A translanguaging view. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38, 33-59.
- [41] Wei, Li, & Lin, Angel MY. (2019). Translanguaging classroom discourse: Pushing limits, breaking boundaries. In (Vol. 10, pp. 209-215): Taylor & Francis.
- [42] Williams, Cen. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In *The Language Policy: Taking Stock*, edited by C. Williams, G. Lewis, and C. Baker. Llangefni, Wales: CAI. pp. 39–78. *The language policy: Taking stock*, 12(2), 193-211.
- [43] Yamada-Rice, Dylan. (2014). The semiotic landscape and 3-year-olds' emerging understanding of multimodal communication practices. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 12(2), 154-184.